

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

T5843

from reinfestation from Mexico is to establish a barrier zone along the border in which sterile flies can be systematically distributed. This proposed barrier zone is a national responsibility and cannot be accomplished by the State of Texas, nor by local interests.

The request in this regard is for the appropriation of \$5,500,000 with no requirement of local matching. This sum is sufficient for the continuation of a highly effective program of great importance to the Southwest. Unless the Department of Agriculture can assume responsibility for the program, the \$12 million investment which has been made may be sacrificed and the gains made in screw-worm eradication will be lost.

I shall be happy to supply additional information and urge your subcommittee's favorable consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.

COFFEE AGREEMENT WILL SOLVE ONE PROBLEM BY CREATING ANOTHER

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, H.R. 8864 purports to implement the International Coffee Agreement of 1962.

When the Senate gave its advice and consent to the ratification of this treaty on May 21, 1963, there were doubts as to whether this agreement would be in the best interest of the United States. The pending legislation recalls and renews those reservations.

Any international commodity treaty is a mixture of economic and diplomatic purposes. This coffee agreement is no exception.

Economically, the stated purpose of the agreement is to keep the price of coffee stable, by placing a floor under its price in the world market.

Diplomatically, the unstated purpose of the agreement is to provide for stable coffee prices for many Latin and South American nations having a one-crop economy, thereby providing for a stable government.

Mr. President, that treaty and this legislation would solve one problem by creating another. While the treaty and H.R. 8864 would place a floor under world coffee prices, it would establish no ceiling. Price stability would be achieved only below a certain price. Above the international price-support level, fluctuations are probable and possible. The United States, as the purchaser of 52 percent of the world's supply of coffee, as the largest coffee importer in the world, has a justifiable concern.

Mr. President, it should be noted that between the time when the treaty was ratified and the time when H.R. 8864 was made the pending business of the Senate, there has been an increase of 17 cents a pound—or 50 percent—in the wholesale price of coffee.

We are told that natural disasters in Brazil have reduced coffee stocks. But a shortage attributed to this cause is artificial. Brazil has a stored surplus sufficient to offset the past year's disaster.

Moreover, these facts were known to the International Coffee Council. The Council, however, refused to increase quotas, accepted the artificial shortage, and thereby raised the price for all—including the American consumer.

Under this treaty and legislation, a single producing and exporting nation, or a coalition of such countries, could limit supplies and could increase the world price.

Proponents of the treaty and the legislation claim that the United States has sufficient influence as the largest coffee importer and enough votes on the International Coffee Council to be able to prevent actions which would be adverse to our consumer interest and our rising cost-of-living index.

In answer to this assertion, it should be noted that our voting power on the International Coffee Council is not equal to our percentage of imports or to our interest in the world coffee market. Second, in the first test—the quota problem due to the Brazilian shortage—our representatives were unable to prevent the increase.

Proponents of the treaty and the legislation assert that the United States could always "swing a vote" by exerting greater diplomatic pressure. Such a move would indeed be a poor substitute for appropriate voting power, and would be certain to result in a loss of trust and friendship with our Latin American neighbors.

Proponents of the treaty and this legislation claim that defeat of this implementing legislation would be inconsistent with our pledges under the Alliance for Progress. It is true that we have promised to promote stable and strong economies in Latin America.

The inconsistency, however, lies in the possible detrimental effects of this treaty on the economy of the United States. In order for the United States to promote and encourage stable and strong economies abroad, we must have one ourselves.

Enactment of this legislation could be another element of disruption to the U.S. economy, as much as it would be an element of stabilization to the Latin American economies.

Proponents of the treaty and the legislation point out that the United States can always withdraw from the agreement, after serving a 90-day notice of such intention. Technically, this is true. Yet such an argument discounts diplomatic pressures. A better answer is the rejection of this bill.

CUTTING COSTS OF ARCTIC OIL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, over a year ago, I introduced Senate bill 1496. This measure would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to produce and sell crude oil from the Umiat field, Navy Petroleum Reserve No. 4, with the purpose of making local fuel available for limited use in oil and gas exploration now being carried on north of the Brooks Range, in Arctic Alaska. A companion measure was introduced in the House by Congressman RALPH RIVERS.

Yesterday, the Senate gave its final approval to this measure; and it is on its way to the President, for his signature. I believe this measure, although not a major piece of legislation, will contribute

in a significant manner to the development of the newest and most significant industry in Alaska: oil. Alaska's burgeoning oil industry has been, until now, largely concentrated in the southwestern part of the State. There are at the present time 66 producing wells in the Swanson River and in the Kenai and Sterling fields. Soon there will be additional producing wells in the Cook Inlet region.

These resources are both rich and extensive; their development will be of great assistance to Alaska's economic advancement.

Far to the north, however, deep within the Arctic Circle, over the Brooks Range, there lie oil and gas reserves which may be of even greater import. These may, according to the New York Times, even rival the resources of the Arab Peninsula.

The bill passed yesterday will assist in the exploration and development of these great resources.

Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 lies in the center of this region rich in oil potential. The Umiat oil field, which is part of the reserve, was discovered in 1945. Eight successful wells have been drilled. This field, completely held by the Navy, is estimated to contain at least 50 million barrels of recoverable oil. Although this is recoverable oil, and although there are even now wells and pumps on the site, there have been no recovery. The oil is not used, nor is the equipment, although it is kept in a condition of standby readiness. The wells at Umiat are comparatively shallow ones. The oil produced will fuel diesel engines or stoves, just as it comes from the ground. No treatment or processing of any kind is necessary.

The bill provides that the oil as it comes out of the ground may be sold to companies doing exploration and development work in the field, to be used to fuel their drill rigs and to keep their equipment warm and operable in the freezing temperatures of winter.

At the present time, fuel costs constitute the largest single expense in Arctic exploration work. Recently, a gas well was drilled in the nearby Gubik area. The fuel costs of this operation exceeded by 20 percent the drilling costs.

All fuel oil used on the Arctic slopes must be flown in from Fairbanks, 450 miles away, or barged in during the summer from Norman Wells, in Canada, 1,000 miles away. Costs range from 93 cents to \$1.30 a gallon. A barrel of oil selling for \$3 in Anchorage will cost in excess of \$35 at Umiat.

The Navy has petroleum ready and available. Two of its wells are in operating condition. The drilling rig, the pumping unit, and the diesel engine are installed at the wellhead. This oil is now available, without additional expense to the Government.

The sale of Umiat oil would be made at no cost to the Government; in fact, it is expected that the Government will receive a profit from the operation. It is contemplated that the oil would be sold in the ground, with the purchaser being obliged to pump it from the existing productive wells, for limited use, and only

for companies exploring the area. The sale would be through competitive bids, and all proceeds would be clear profit to the Government.

The Government will gain more than money from the development of a commercial oil field in the Arctic. At the present time, the Navy has its oil and its field, but no means of transporting the oil from the field to wherever it might be needed. A commercial oil field must develop practical means of transporting the oil out of the Arctic—either by pipeline or by tanker, or by a combination of the two. When this is done, the Navy will then have means of access to its supplies of crude oil within the reserve, which then would be available for use in time of emergency. Development of a commercial oil field in the Arctic will thus be of substantial value to the Navy's oil field, as well.

There is no intention of putting the Navy in the oil-selling business, in competition with private enterprise. Disposition of the oil is to be made only in the immediate area of Umiat, and only for the purpose of supporting oil exploration operations. The authority to make such sales is to expire January 1, 1969. It is not contemplated that by means of this bill the Navy should have any but temporary authority to sell oil.

Alaska is rich in natural resources which have yet to be developed. In the years to come, Alaska will be rich, in fact—but not until her resources are developed. The bill finally passed yesterday will assist in this; and, as such, it will be to the benefit of both Alaska and the Union.

OAS MINISTERS MEETING ON CUBAN SANCTIONS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, today in Washington there opens an event that should have an immense impact upon the future of the Western Hemisphere and particularly upon the fortunes of Cuban-based communism. Today in the salubrious chambers of the Pan American Union Building, 19 of the 20 member states of the OAS begin deliberations on a resolution calling for sanctions against "Doctor" Castro's Communist empire.

The meeting of Latin American foreign ministers, augmented by a Mexican Ambassador, will consider a question which stripped of its tinsel and euphemization is simply: Will the Inter-American Organization which ostensibly represents the peaceful aspirations of 400 million people continue to condone acts of aggression and lawlessness by Communist Cuba, or will the Organization of all the free Americas, with the United States as its helm, take significant actions against the malignancy that infests our hemisphere?

Despite the fact that the press has virtually ignored this meeting, the decisions emanating from it could be of tremendous importance in the free world's struggle against communism.

Under the terms of the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance the Latin American ministers have a limitless latitude of choice. They could vote to make war against Cuba, which is unlikely; or they

could vote to do nothing whatsoever about the formal charge of aggression entered by Venezuela. If the U.S. position prevails they may do the latter. If the Venezuelan and Costa Rican positions triumph the vote could favor strong sanctions—probably the termination of diplomatic, trade, and communications links between the continent and the Pearl of the Antilles. Hopefully the stronger view will seek the most articulate champions realistically, the meeting can be expected to produce some sort of compromise the exact degree of which concerns this Nation vitally.

I was privileged last March 3 to read into the Record almost the entire text of the OAS indictment which is the basis for this meeting. The report was masterfully prepared—comprehensive, completely documented, and absolutely unchallengeable.

The facts of Castro's aggressions against Latin America—particularly Venezuela—are too well known to require elaboration now.

This meeting gets underway only 3 days after Captive Nations Week. Since the ministers are to determine or at least discuss the future of the newest and most sorely oppressed of the captive nations I think it behooves us to dwell a moment on the week past and to propound at least four points of inquiry:

First. Why are the captive nations captive?

Second. To whom are the captive nations indebted for their involuntary servitude?

Third. What are we doing about their plight?

Fourth. Who will be the next captive nation?

The ploy that ceded the bulk of Eastern Europe to communism at the end of World War II was pathetically simple. The Soviets dropped an Iron Curtain "from Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic"—as Winston Churchill phrased it. The curtain encompassed nine nations. There soon followed China on the Asian land mass and 10 years later, Cuba.

Today there are captive nations on three—and possibly four—continents. And as the administration continues its assurances that the dynamism of communism's advance has been blunted by Khrushchev's smile, nations throughout Latin America, Asia, and Africa face that moment that will determine whether their future holds freedom, or captivity.

The "why" of the captive nations then is basically that communism wanted to bring nearly a billion people under its hegemony more than the free world which takes its signals from the United States, wanted to secure their liberty.

The decisions effecting the peoples to whom Captive Nations Week is consecrated are made in Moscow and Peiping—not Washington.

In his book, "Protracted Conflict," author Max Eastman points out:

The measure of success of Communist strategy is that the Reds have gained control of region, heretofore, firmly held by the Western Powers—without provoking a counterattack by the West. The West has been

willing to give a round and take a round, but the result has been a steady loss of power.

This lesson is patent in a study of recent history and yet the administration fails to realize that every tactical offensive we launch has been not to advance the cause of freedom but to maintain a previous status quo which intrinsically favors the enemy.

I submit, Mr. President, that in the face of a patently spurious threat emanating from a nation that never once has used force against a major power to fulfill her illicit desires, we have forfeited the freedom of more than one-third of the people on this earth.

Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Albania, Bulgaria, Outer Mongolia, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, North Korea, Hungary, East Germany, Mainland China, Tibet, North Vietnam, and Cuba: these are some of the captive nations. They owe their captivity as much to American duplicity, timidity, and indecision as to the conquestodial aspirations of their Communist masters.

One year ago I took the floor to point out that "the last remaining colonial empire in the world is ruled by the Soviet Union. It is the cruelest, the most oppressive and the least responsive to the legitimate aspirations of the captive people." I opined that "freedom will not come to the captive nations unless the United States exerts unrelenting pressure to drive the wedge of freedom into the cracks of discontent that are appearing in the Iron Curtain." I believe, Mr. President, that those assertions are still credible today.

I ventured the thought also on that occasion that "the ultimate objective of communism is to add the bastion of freedom, America, to its growing list of captive nations. Whether or not they succeed will depend not on our readiness to accommodate ourselves to their chicanery but on our strength, our courage, and our dedication to the eventual freedom of all mankind. We must never place ourselves in a position of surrendering freedom for a compromising peace."

We are today seeking a compromising peace and we are failing to acknowledge the substantive distinction between peace and freedom. We observe Captive Nations Week, not in the hope of bringing peace to the captive nations, for they have peace, a Communist peace, circa 1964.

Captive Nations Week, pursuant to the joint resolution of July 17, 1959, involves itself not a whit with peace. It commits the United States absolutely to the principle of absolute freedom—to "the cause of freedom and justice everywhere," as this year's proclamation phrases it.

I should like to interject at this point, Mr. President, that I was struck by the text of the Captive Nations Week proclamation. Nowhere in its 8 paragraphs and 21 lines did it identify the jailor of the captive nations. There is no reference to Russia or to Peiping or even to Cuba. There is one declarative sentence, which is certainly commendable, but were a stranger to apprise himself of Captive Nations Week by reading the

1964

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

15845

President's proclamation, he would be sorely pressed to identify the nations, the captives, or the circumstances which created them.

Mr. President, some 6,000 Cubans attempt every month to flee Castro's police state. About one-third of them reach safety. The other 4,000 are either swallowed up by the sea or are executed by Castro for their efforts.

I recently interviewed the chairman of the Committee of Cuban Jurists of Washington, D.C., Dr. Juan Lliteras, and in the words of this articulate and knowledgeable attorney and author:

There are thousands, constantly that are escaping in small boats with small children, and women. Most of these people do not belong to the upper classes or the middle classes which have long since abandoned the country or been killed. These are working people. We realize that there must be terrible conditions inside Cuba. People simply cannot stand it. Recently one boat was found carrying 17 persons, among them 5 women and 4 children. Of these only one was alive when the boat reached Jamaica. The captain of a boat that travels the Caribbean said recently there is not a single trip in which he does not find several refugee boats bullet riddled, full of dead bodies and bodies floating around. Nevertheless, we hear nothing about these terrible things that are happening.

In the words of Premier Castro's sister, who defected recently, the people of Cuba have been nailed to a "cross of torment" and all of Latin America is endangered by the Communist apparatus headquartered in Havana.

The third of our four inquiries—what are we going to do about the captive nations—is easier to ask than to answer.

Essential to any victory over communism and hence the freedom of the captive peoples is a cognizance that, in the words of Max Eastman:

Communist theory holds that the whole world is a battlefield upon which opposing forces are locked in a conflict of indefinite duration . . . to the Communists what we call peace is merely war conducted by other than military means.

The first step toward a termination of the enslavement of the captive nations becomes then the realization that we are engaged in a mortal struggle for the future of our society; our philosophy of government, which is the foundation of all contemporary representative governments; and indeed the future of mankind itself.

Such an admission would constitute an ipso facto indictment of the preposterous anomalies which find the United States condemning the sale of buses to Cuba in the same breath drawn to announce the sale of wheat to Russia.

Wheat sales to the Soviet Union and its satellites are only a part of the new accommodation line toward world communism. Georgetown University professor, Dr. Lev Dobriansky, speaking on the Georgetown University Forum July 12, said:

I think one of the greatest faults on really a most serious intellectual error that's going to drive us into considerable danger in months or maybe years to come is the present orientation of our policy accommodating the various regimes in Central Europe, in my judgment, with the illusions

of thinking that they will wean them away from Moscow completely and as a consequence bring about freedom and independence for the people; namely, the Nation itself. Instead, we will, I think . . . find ourselves working for the entrenchment of these regimes against the peoples, the nations, and in aggregate really helping the entire Communist empire.

The fundamental question of "Which way the captive nations?" was answered in part by another program speaker, Freedom Facts editor, Donald Miller:

The people who have studied revolution thoroughly over the years have come to the conclusion that three elements are necessary in a change of this kind. One is a strong desire for freedom or strong desire for independence among the people in the countries involved. Second is a weakness in the ruling regime—inability of the regime to apply their full coercive force. And the third is an outside power which at one hand is encouraging people within captive nations to express their freedom and speak it, and on the other hand it's seeking to weaken the power of the ruling regimes to enforce their dominion over these people.

The question of captive nations did not end with Captive Nations Week. It will certainly not end with this week's OAS meeting in Washington, but it might be brought a step closer to a solution.

Several thousand Cuban exiles are in Washington today, Mr. President, to "vote with their feet" in support of a firm position by the OAS. The exiles will meet near the Washington Monument and proceed in midafternoon to the site of the Conference, there to present a petition to the ministers.

These exiles harbor no illusions as to the outcome of this Conference. As one of their spokesmen put it in a statement released to the press today:

If after 5 years of servitude and incredible suffering at the hands of their Communist oppressors, the rights of the Cuban people have not been recognized, we would be less than candid were we to expect that the Inter-American Conference meeting in Washington today will break their shackles.

The Cuban statement continues by saying:

We have long learned the bitter lesson taught by our apostle, Jose Marti: "Liberty is not to be begged. It must be conquered, by freemen."

The Cubans with whom I have spoken have their own reply to the fourth point of my original inquiries. In their opinion, if America would take cognizance of the lessons of recent history and recognize the imminent and very real danger facing the United States and the free world, there would be no new partners to the ignominious confederation of captive nations and Cuba would be freed.

As to their own situation, the Cubans who are marching on Washington today make this statement:

In this war against the forces of evil, we labor under no illusions; we are counting neither on governments nor on international bodies. Our faith is pinned on man alone—man, fashioned after the likeness of God and who thus must ever aspire and struggle to be free.

It is to be sincerely hoped that the message of these Cubans will be heard by the ministers meeting in Washington

today, especially by the American representatives, for there is much at stake here.

I turn again to the exiles for a summation of the question: Whether this despotism implanted in Cuba, while our friends looked away, is to overwhelm America; whether the Red tide, already lapping these shores, is to engulf us all, time shall tell. Time shall tell whether liberty, born in America, is to perish in America.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE FREEMAN TOURS WEST VIRGINIA SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS AND STRIP MINE RECLAMATION PROJECTS—STATE PROGRAM DEMONSTRATES DYNAMIC NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, in my view there are few opportunities more satisfying than those afforded to observe the dedicated efforts of officials and citizens engaged cooperatively in making the soil conservation program the workable and useful instrumentality that it has become throughout the country.

Because of our terrain contours and because of the further fact that we have substantial extractive natural resource industrial operations in West Virginia, we have special need for the best practices and the most aggressive efforts in soil conservation.

These are activities in which I have had a special interest and concern over a long span of time.

Yesterday, Mr. President, the West Virginia soil conservationists and the program to which they are dedicated received the acclaim, the encouragement, and the cooperation to which they are entitled.

The occasion was the sixth annual tridistrict tour on Monday, July 20, sponsored by the West Fork, Tygarts Valley, and Monongahela Soil Conservation Districts, with six additional districts as guests and participants.

The principal inspiration was provided by the diligent, dedicated, and capable U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, whom I was privileged to accompany on his much appreciated West Virginia all day visit. We were joined by Donald A. Williams, Administrator of the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service, and Gordon Zimmerman, executive secretary of the National Association of Water Conservation Districts.

A tour in Lewis County to observe strip mine reclamation work was conducted during the morning, with Luther Britton, secretary of the West Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts, as the leader. At the Yates-Norris farm, Mr. Britton discussed with clarity, "The Soil Conservation District's Part in Reclamation of Surface Mine Spoil." Harold Gregoire, reclamation inspector for the West Virginia Department of Natural Resources, helpfully explained the responsibilities of this department in enforcement and reclamation. State Director W. F. Eigen-

15846

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 21

brod, of the State department of mines, stated well the responsibilities of his department in the reclamation program.

When the group moved to the Laura Evans farm, Dr. A. H. VanLandingham, director of the West Virginia University Experiment Station, spoke knowingly of the role of the experiment station in revegetation of mine spoil. Everett R. Leadbetter, State soil conservationist for the soil conservation service, discussed factually the planning for reclamation of surface mine spoil. And Thomas B. Evans, State conservationist for the soil conservation service, gave a graphic summary of the stabilization work.

During the noon hour, Secretary Freeman and those in his party were honored at the pavilion of the beautiful 4-H camp at Jackson's Mill, near Weston, where the farm women from several counties served luncheon to a large gathering which grew to over 600 persons at the program which followed.

Clarence Jackson, president of the West Virginia Association of Soil Conservation Districts, delivered the welcome message and introduced this Senator, affording me the privilege of presenting Secretary Freeman for the third time in our State.

The former Governor of Minnesota was the Shepherd College commencement orator and also the featured honor guest speaker at the Elkins Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. President, I shall ask subsequently for permission to have excerpts from the thought-provoking speech of the able Secretary of Agriculture printed in the Record. It was a gratefully received and much-appreciated message on the role and the future of rural America.

At the conclusion of his address, Secretary Freeman was introduced to the boards of supervisors of the nine participating soil conservation districts. He then signed a memorandum of understanding between the U.S. Department of Agriculture and each of the following boards: West Fork, Tygarts Valley, Monongahela, Elk, Potomac Valley, Little Kanawha, Upper Ohio, Guyan, and Southern.

Following these ceremonies, the Secretary and party were joined by conservation officials and citizens from many areas in a watershed development tour, visiting installations completed and under construction in the Polk Creek watershed west of Weston in Lewis County.

Paul Butcher, Sr., president, and Raymond Squires, treasurer, of the Polk Creek Watershed Association, led an informative discussion of local participations in watershed activities. Mr. Squires spoke also as a member of the county court of Lewis County, a group most earnest in its support. Subsequently, Jack Busfield of the Salt Lick Watershed Association and a veteran soil conservation district leader, related the soil conservation districts and the watershed program in the final discussion of the tour.

Special recognition should be given the efforts of Chester Cunningham, secretary of the Tri-District Soil Conservation Association. Mr. Cunningham was instru-

mental in the planning and coordination of many events included in this worthwhile tour.

Mr. President, the leadership and inspiration supplied by Secretary Freeman, the demonstration of dedication, teamwork, and enthusiasm demonstrated by all who participated in the program—and by the directors of the soil conservation districts and watershed associations—reinforce our conviction that West Virginia will maintain its consistent record of leadership in the vital work of reclamation. In the spirit of coordinated cooperation we are striving to insure a more meaningful future for citizens of the Mountain State and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from statements by officials participating in the sixth annual tridistrict tour, together with excerpts from an address by Secretary Freeman on that occasion, be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS OF HAROLD C. GREGOIRE, RECLAMATION INSPECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES, STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

In 1961 West Virginia's Legislature created the reclamation division in the department of natural resources. All land and water aspects of surface mining reclamation was placed under the jurisdiction of this division.

The reclamation division is responsible for regrading to insure proper drainage and revegetation of all affected areas where surface mining has been conducted. I emphasize the importance of the regrading process in minimizing soil erosion and water pollution.

The entire program of reclamation in West Virginia is based on cooperation between the State departments of natural resources, the Bureau of Mines, the Soil Conservation Service, and the soil conservation districts.

EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT BY HON. DON A. WILLIAMS, ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

West Virginia has taken the lead among the Appalachian States in its strip mine reclamation work. Here is a wonderful evidence of cooperation on privately owned lands through team effort. Strip mine operators are financing the vegetating of spoil areas by contracting with local soil conservation districts for the tree, shrub, grass, and legume planting. This work is done in conformity with the requirements of the State department of natural resources and as planned by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service. Excellent results have been obtained at reasonable cost. This cooperative and voluntary approach benefits all concerned and may well be an example for other States having this kind of problem.

TWENTY-FIVE YEARS OF STRIP MINING
(Excerpts from a statement by W. F. Eigenbrod, director, West Virginia Department of Mines)

For over a quarter of a century West Virginia has had a strip mine law. During World War II this method of procuring coal was widely used because of its speed and convenience, and even then the need for reclamation was noted.

John G. Hall, of Reedsville, was a pioneer in this vital work. Too often, strip mining resulted in harmful erosion and water pollution, and various State agencies began the tasks of regulation, control, and reclamation.

During the course of this experimentation it became evident that special techniques were required in this effort at all levels of planning and implementation. Today, with the cooperation of the soil conservation districts and Soil Conservation Service technicians reclamation plans have been developed and well over 90 percent of revegetation planting is being done by the districts.

The success of our programs was recognized at a recent meeting attended by representatives of 20 Eastern States. It is worthwhile to note that West Virginia was the only State with a functioning plan for the reclamation of barren areas which have for some reason been overlooked. This procedure, now written into law, calls for cooperation between strip mine operators and the State and has proven a significant source of conservation revenue.

In 1961 the department of natural resources assumed responsibility for the reclaiming of strip mined areas. The department of mines maintained supervision as long as the production of coal continues. The department administers all mine operation to insure safe working conditions, preserve life, limb, and property, and to protect our natural resources.

ROLE OF WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION IN REGULATION OF MINE SPOIL

(Excerpts from a statement by A. H. VanLandingham, director, Agricultural Experiment Station)

The experiment station is involved in research dealing with the many factors related to the handling of spoil material, grading drainage, and the treatment of spoil for planting. We are also concerned with the evaluation of plant materials, trees, grasses, and vines which are most suitable for use in spoil areas. We seek to improve methods of material handling resulting from planning of mining operations.

The experiment station, through the State land reclamation specialist (a member of the station staff), serves as a liaison between agencies and individuals with interest or responsibility in strip mine reclamation work.

EXCERPTS FROM A STATEMENT BY THOMAS B. EVANS, STATE CONSERVATIONIST, SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

As I listened to the splendid presentations by Luther Britton, Harold Gregoire, Dr. VanLandingham, and Everett Leadbetter, I could think of no better way to summarize than to accent the cooperative efforts which has resulted in bringing thousands of devastated acres back to the condition of these you have seen today.

Such a change does not come about automatically. Because we have people with vision to see the need for the future and the gumption to fight for what they believe, we have in West Virginia one of the finest strip mine reclamation laws in the Nation. The reclamation work is financed by the organizations that cause the problem, i.e., the strip mine operators themselves.

West Virginia is a beautiful State and its beautiful green hills and rushing streams are among its main scenic attractions. Ugly scars caused by strip mining operations adversely effect the image West Virginia is endeavoring to project to tourists and vacationers. Likewise, silt from spoil areas has clogged many small streams and damaged much good farm bottom land, and streams and reservoirs have been polluted from mine acids. On the other hand, strip mining is an established industry and represents employment and profits. Therefore, one industry is in direct competition with the other. Reclaiming strip mined areas is a way of mitigating the extreme differences between the two.

Although our laws are good and the cooperation between agencies is excellent, we